



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,263	12/27/1999	PAUL H. STALLINGS	31408-10229	8507

7590 11/20/2002

JENNER & BLOCK  
ATTN ERIC H WEIMERS  
ONE IBM PLAZA  
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER

DAY, HERNG-DER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/472,263

Applicant(s)

STALLINGS ET AL.

Examiner

Herng-der Day

Art Unit

2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 1 has been examined and claim 1 has been rejected.

#### *Drawings*

2. The Draftsperson has objected to the drawings; see the copy of Form PTO 948 for an explanation.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### *Abstract*

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

***Specification***

4. The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading and entry of amendments difficult. A substitute specification with lines double spaced on good quality paper is required.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities. Appropriate correction is required.

5-1. It appears that " $S(u,v)$ ", as described in line 45 of page 3, should be " $s(u,v)$ ".

5-2. The vector representations of functions are not consistent. For example, in page 4,  $c(t)$  in lines 10-11 is a  $1 \times 3$  vector, however, in line 14,  $c(t)$  is a  $3 \times 1$  vector.

***Claim Objections***

6. The claims are objected to because the lines are crowded too closely together, making reading and entry of amendments difficult. Substitute pages containing the claims with lines one and one-half or double spaced on good quality paper are required. See 37 CFR 1.52(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 2123

For example, as described in lines 4-5 of page 3, "The present invention allows accurate transformation of a CAD model by an arbitrary function using a generalized transformation mechanism". Accordingly, one skilled in the art may select  $f = 0$  as the arbitrary transformation function and obtain the origin as the accurately transformed CAD model. However, it is unclear how one skilled in the art may use the invention for a desired geometry if all of the ultimately transformed CAD models are origins.

Next, as described in lines 1-2 of page 3, "Space warping is a process by which the geometry of a model is changed leaving the topology the same". However, with an arbitrary transformation function, several positions of the original vertices may be transformed to the same new position. Accordingly, it is unclear how one skilled in the art may warp the model, i.e., leaving the topology the same, by using an arbitrary transformation function.

Then, at page 5, as described in line 28, variables  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  are defined in the domain of function  $f \bullet s1(x,y,z)$ . It is contradictory to the definition of function  $s1(u,v)$  as described in line 23. Also note, another contradictory definition exists between function  $f \bullet c1(x,y,z)$  and function  $c1(t)$  at the same page. Accordingly, it is unclear how one skilled in the art may use those defined functions, i.e.,  $f \bullet s1(x,y,z)$  and  $f \bullet c1(x,y,z)$ , to perform the function composition.

With contradictory definition for the new surface function and the new curve function, as well as the option to use an arbitrary function for transformation, claim 1 eventually contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2123

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation “an arbitrary function” in line 3 of the claim. It is vague and indefinite about the arbitrary function. For the purpose of claim examination, the Examiner will presume that the limitation “an arbitrary function” in line 3 of the claim refers to “a mirroring function”.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2123

12. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen, U.S. Patent 6,212,484 issued April 3, 2001 and filed September 8, 1998.

Chen discloses a method for using surface and curve functions and positions in a CAD model to define the geometry of a shape to allow the transformation of the shape with a mirroring function, said method comprising the steps of:

- a. Obtaining a solid model containing one or more faces, edges and/or vertices, where the underlying geometry of each face, edge or vertex may be represented, respectively by a surface, curve, or position, and each surface or curve may be represented by a function mapping from a domain space into 3-dimensional space (illustration 208, FIG. 2 and 4; and physical body 300, FIG. 3);
- b. Defining a transformation function mapping from 3-dimensional space to 3-dimensional space (new mirroring function 120, FIG. 4 and column 4, lines 34-36);
- c. Creating new surface and curve functions by performing function composition with each of the existing surface and curve functions with the transformation function (mapping relationship by equation, column 5 lines 14-27);
- d. Creating new, surfaces and curves by taking each point in the domain of each of the original surface and curve functions and passing the point through the corresponding new function, and creating new positions by passing each original position through the transformation function (illustration 402, FIG. 4; and logical body 302, FIG. 3); and
- e. Resetting the geometry of the CAD model (generate the lines and curves, column 4, lines 56-58).

Art Unit: 2123

*Conclusion*

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reference to Kawabe et al., U.S. Patent 5,278,983 issued January 11, 1994, is cited as disclosing a boundary representation solid modeling system.

Reference to Raghothama et al., "Boundary Representation Deformation in Parametric Solid Modeling", ACM Transactions on Graphics, Volume 17, Issue 4, October 1998, pages 259-286, is cited as disclosing boundary representation deformation.

Reference to Fane "Your Table Is Waiting...", CADalyst, January 1999, pages 70-75, is cited as disclosing of modifying CAD drawings through spreadsheet.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Herng-der Day whose telephone number is (703) 305-526. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin J Teska can be reached on (703) 305-9704.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Herng-der Day  
November 15, 2002



SAMUEL BRODA, ESQ.  
PATENT EXAMINER



## Recent Statutory Changes to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On November 2, 2002, President Bush signed the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (H.R. 2215) (Pub. L. 107-273, 116 Stat. 1758 (2002)), which further amended 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) (Pub. L. 106-113, 113 Stat. 1501 (1999)). The revised provisions in 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are completely retroactive and effective immediately for all applications being examined or patents being reexamined. Until all of the Office's automated systems are updated to reflect the revised statute, citation to the revised statute in Office actions is provided by this attachment. This attachment also substitutes for any citation of the text of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), if made, in the attached Office action.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of the AIPA and H.R. 2215 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

**A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –**

**(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.**

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the AIPA and H.R. 2215, applies to all qualifying references, except when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. For such patents, the prior art date is determined under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 prior to the amendment by the AIPA that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

**A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –**

**(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.**

For more information on revised 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) visit the USPTO website at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov) or call the Office of Patent Legal Administration at (703) 305-1622.

**Attachment for PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier)**  
**6/18/01**

**The below text replaces the pre-printed text under the heading, "Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes," on the back of the PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier) form.**

**INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES**

**1. Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85**

New corrected drawings must be filed with the changes **incorporated** therein. Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin. If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the Notice of Allowability. Extensions of time may **NOT** be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability. The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

**2. Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.**

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made, other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

**Timing of Corrections**

Applicant is required to submit the drawing corrections within the time period set in the attached Office communication. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.